#### Message

From: D'Andrea, Michael [DANDREA.MICHAEL@EPA.GOV]

**Sent**: 8/24/2016 10:01:30 PM

To: Johnson, KarenD [Johnson.KarenD@epa.gov]

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

lagree - one signature.

Shawn has chimed in and wants to the Chief of Staff to make a decision.

Not sure what will happen.

Mike

From: Johnson, KarenD

Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 1:35 PM

To: D'Andrea, Michael < DANDREA.MICHAEL@EPA.GOV>

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

Thanks Mike- We were in favor of Susan or someone in HQ sending out on behalf of all Regions and HQ, but knew we'd never get three signatures!

From: D'Andrea, Michael

Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 12:20 PM

To: Davies, Lynne <Davies.Lynne@epa.gov>; Johnson, KarenD <Johnson.KarenD@epa.gov>; Duchovnay, Andrew

<Duchovnay.Andrew@epa.gov>; Clark, Jacqueline <clark.jacqueline@epa.gov>; Wilson, Jennifer

<wilson.jenniferA@epa.gov>; Reinhart, Roger <Reinhart.Roger@epa.gov>; Collins, Charlie <collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Cc: Graff, Jeannine < Graff. Jeannine@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

To be honest, it doesn't make sense to me to have three signatures. To those outside EPA, and the image we should project, is that we are EPA (not R3, 5, HQ).

I might be swayed if there was specific reason, but the letter is so short and to the point. We are simply saying that the issue is confidential.

In a few mins. I have a mtg with my RA, who was supposed to sign the letter. I'll ask him and let you know.

Thanks.

Mike

From: Davies, Lynne

Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 10:44 AM

To: Johnson, KarenD < Johnson. KarenD@epa.gov >; Duchovnay, Andrew < Duchovnay. Andrew@epa.gov >; Clark,

Jacqueline < clark.jacqueline@epa.gov>; Wilson, Jennifer < wilson.jenniferA@epa.gov>; Reinhart, Roger

<Reinhart.Roger@epa.gov>; Collins, Charlie <collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Cc: D'Andrea, Michael < DANDREA.MICHAEL@EPA.GOV>

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

Thanks, Karen – I was on the phone with Susan and her recommendation was that Region 3, Region 5, and HQ have one response (all signed). We should send one letter with three signatures, I think.

Mike, is this a problem? I'm sorry.

Lynne

From: Johnson, KarenD

Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 10:41 AM

**To:** Davies, Lynne <a href="mailto:Davies.Lynne@epa.gov">Davies.Lynne@epa.gov</a>; Duchovnay, Andrew <a href="mailto:Duchovnay.Andrew@epa.gov">Duchovnay.Andrew@epa.gov</a>; Clark, Jacqueline@epa.gov</a>; Clark, Jacqueline@epa.gov</a>; Reinhart, Roger <a href="mailto:Reinhart">Reinhart, Roger <a href="mailto:Reinhart">Reinhart</a>, Reinhart <a href="mailto:Reinhart">Reinhart</a>, Reinhart</a>, Reinhart</a

Collins, Charlie < collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Cc: D'Andrea, Michael < DANDREA.MICHAEL@EPA.GOV >

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

That wasn't our understanding. I've copied Mike D'Andrea who has our current response for Shawn's review and approval. I'd figure he will coordinate with HQ but we didn't know there would only be one response. We've run into him turning this around in his next letter saying he hasn't gotten responses from X Region, or recipients of previous letters...

If we all send the same letter with various signatures would that work?

From: Davies, Lynne

Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2016 10:38 AM

To: Duchovnay, Andrew < <u>Duchovnay</u>. Andrew@epa.gov>; Clark, Jacqueline < <u>clark.jacqueline@epa.gov</u>>; Johnson,

KarenD < Johnson. KarenD@epa.gov>; Wilson, Jennifer < wilson.jenniferA@epa.gov>; Reinhart, Roger

<Reinhart.Roger@epa.gov>; Collins, Charlie <collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

All — we need to discuss the Bilott response at 11. Susan reiterated this morning that there should be ONE response from HQ, Region 3, and Region 5. She wants Shari to review. Has the letter been sent yet? If not, we need to discuss and have HQ send. I'm sorry if there was any confusion.

From: Duchovnay, Andrew

Sent: Monday, August 22, 2016 10:59 AM

To: Davies, Lynne <Davies.Lynne@epa.gov>; Clark, Jacqueline <clark.jacqueline@epa.gov>; Johnson, KarenD

<Johnson.KarenD@epa.gov>; Wilson, Jennifer <wilson.jenniferA@epa.gov>; Reinhart, Roger

<Reinhart.Roger@epa.gov>; Collins, Charlie <collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

-li all. Ex. 5 AC/AWP/DP . Any objection	ions?
--	-------

### Ex. 5 AC/AWP/DP

Thanks, Andy

From: Davies, Lynne

Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 1:23 PM

To: Clark, Jacqueline <clark.jacqueline@epa.gov>; Duchovnay, Andrew < Duchovnay.Andrew@epa.gov>; Johnson,

KarenD < Johnson. KarenD@epa.gov>; Wilson, Jennifer < wilson.jennifer A@epa.gov>; Reinhart, Roger

<Reinhart.Roger@epa.gov>; Collins, Charlie <collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Draft language to review

Ex. 5 AC/AWP/DP

# Ex. 5 AC/AWP/DP

Andy, let me know if I need to route through HQ further, or if Region 3 will send while Jacquie is on vacation. Many thanks to Jacquie for drafting!

Lynne

From: Clark, Jacqueline

Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 5:25 PM

To: Davies, Lynne <Davies.Lynne@epa.gov>; Duchovnay, Andrew <Duchovnay.Andrew@epa.gov>; Johnson, KarenD

<a href="mailto:sub-nifer/wilson.jennifer/@epa.gov">
https://wilson.jennifer/@epa.gov</a>; Reinhart, Roger

<Reinhart.Roger@epa.gov>; Collins, Charlie <collins.charlie@epa.gov>

Subject: Draft language to review

Importance: High

Hi Team – here is the draft language for responding to Bilott:

# Ex. 5 AC/AWP/DP

#### Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Thanks-Jacquie

Jacqueline Clark

Associate Regional Counsel U.S. EPA, Region 5 (C-14J) 77 W. Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL 60604 Direct: (312) 353-4191 Fax: (312) 385-5474

email: clark.jacqueline@epa.gov

This e-mail, including attachments, contains information that may be confidential, protected by the attorney/client or other privileges, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read this email, delete it, including attachments, and notify the sender that you have received this email in error. The unauthorized use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this e-mail, including attachments, is prohibited and may be unlawful.